

creamed intake that she offers to her twilight children, I shall face the judgement with some hope. And she is dealing with the real situation, the sort of grim situation which faces so many of our own teachers in secondary and primary schools despite the nominal Catholicism of the

families. Lay alongside this the academic little essay by Mrs Houghton and you will return to a remoteness shared by the remaining papers—with the exception perhaps of Sebastian Moore who is always fun.

PETER HASTINGS

ORGANIZATION AND BUREAUCRACY: AN ANALYSIS OF MODERN THEORIES, by Nicos P. Mouzelis. *Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967. 28s.*

Catholics have undoubtedly become increasingly concerned since Vatican II with the general problem of the relationship of their religious organization to rapidly changing social structures, and the ostensible message of Christianity. This has sensitized many to the following interrelated issues: the consequence of church organization for the individual and the quality of human experience; democracy and authoritarianism; the relationship between the clergy and the laity; and more generally the possibility of the displacement of the purpose of the organized Church. Now is it possible, whatever our particular posture on these issues, to see them as symptomatic of the general organizational and bureaucratic features of the Church? Furthermore, is it possible to have a general theory of organizations which is appropriate, say, for the Church, a factory or a bank?

It is precisely this latter question which Dr Mouzelis is concerned with in his analysis of modern theories of organization. His book gives a systematic evaluation of the various schools and sub-schools of organizational thought in terms of their contribution to an adequate theory. At the same time it suggests the direction which future research and theoretical development might fruitfully take.

What are the criteria of theoretical adequacy which Mouzelis takes cognizance of? He states that he is not concerned with theory in the sense of 'interconnected hypotheses about specific organizational problems' which can be subjected to empirical verification. Rather he is concerned with theory as a heuristic guide, that 'provides conceptual tools which indicate the level of analysis, the variables to be taken into consideration and the way in which these may be accounted for in a systematic manner'.

The implications of all this emerge as the discussion of organizational theories unfolds. We discover that the characteristic broad scope of early analysts, such as Marx and Weber, was replaced by the concern of later research with narrow problems such as productivity and morale. There was a tendency

to analyse the organization and the wider society only in so far as they seemed to impinge on such problems. Anyway, these problems were often examined almost explicitly in a psychologist frame of reference.

For example, Taylor extracted the individual from his social environment, examining him in terms of a mechanistic response to reward and punishment. From this model he attempted to make generalizations at the level of the organization. In doing so Taylor moved from one level of analysis to another, neglecting such crucial variables as values, informal organization, or conflicting interests, which later research was to stress. Indeed, Taylor emphasized an essential similarity of interests between individuals and groups in organizations, and regarded conflict as a pathological element.

In analysing the theories, Mouzelis shows how in the various approaches of Taylorism, the Human Relations School, the work of Simon, etc., there was a general trend towards focussing not on the individual level of analysis, but on the organization.

It is important to stress that the various theories are evaluated in terms of their specific contributions to a general theory of organizations. The major objection against them is their partiality, their failure to locate all the relevant variables.

The story therefore becomes one of theories in convergence, and Mouzelis confronts us with three possibilities. One is a theory of consensus as epitomized in the highly developed organizational theory of Talcott Parsons. This approach emphasizes the integrative aspects, stressing values and the distribution of power in terms of organizational goals. The second, much more embryonic, alternative lies with researchers examining organizations specifically in terms of conflict and power. Such a perspective might be pursued and warrants, says Mouzelis, returning to Marx, thus considering 'the possibility of societal values, not as a kind of divine providence caring for the welfare of all sub-systems, but as the dominant ideology

which might in fact legitimize and impose as general interest the narrow interests of certain groups'.

The third alternative is an integration of both approaches. After all, says the author, both are partial truths and refer to complementary aspects of organizations. Research carried out in response to this theoretical orientation would, he argues, be the most fruitful. But the research must be done, particularly on a comparative basis.

BLACK POWER—THE POLITICS OF LIBERATION IN AMERICA, by Stokely Carmichael and Charles V. Hamilton. *Jonathan Cape, 1968. 25s.*

'This book presents a political framework and ideology which represent the last reasonable opportunity for this society to work out its racial problems short of prolonged, destructive guerilla warfare.

'That such violent warfare may be unavoidable is not herein denied. But if there is the slightest chance to avoid it, the politics of Black Power as described in this book is seen as the only viable hope.'

This author's note forming in itself a foreword to the book has a sense of urgency about it; an urgency brought home by the ghetto riots of 1965-1967, each year more intense than the previous one.

Moreover, seen in the context of the tragic assassination of Dr Martin Luther King and the subsequent foretaste of 'destructive guerilla warfare' the arguments of Black Power are of even greater moment.

The authors describe skilfully where, why and in what manner Black people in America must get themselves together. The first chapter 'White Power' denounces American Society as intrinsically sick and describes the more lurid manifestations of that sickness. They show how the white man has always defined the Black man, who he is, what he is and what he must continue to be. They show how because of these definitions and the codes that accompany them white power perpetuates itself, white America maintains its position of priority and superiority and continues to dole out benignly and as it pleases to undeserving Black America.

Black Power as seen by the authors is a political programme, a programme whereby black people, united in a consciousness of themselves as a people, a people with a history and a culture, a people believing in and proud of their goodness and blackness, will rally together and change political forms, reject or reform institutions, say and do themselves what

Dr Mouzelis presents us with an analysis of modern theories which is a welcome change from the catalogue approach. He makes sense of the literature on organizations, relating its contributions to the current state of general theory. The question raised at the end of my first paragraph remains unanswered, but the clues are provided. It is in terms of these clues that the issues raised in that paragraph might be profitably considered.

GORDON J. FYFE

they know is good for them, work to reclaim their human dignity.

These are the very things White America has always told them they are incapable of precisely because of White America's definitions of them.

Broadly speaking the two most salient points in the book and points which the authors labour as being vital to the whole Black Power argument are: (a) the absolute necessity for the black man to denounce the traditional image of himself, clothed in the stereotypes of the 'superior' white man; the necessity to re-define himself and love his Blackness, something essential to the feeling of consciousness as a people; (b) the authors have no faith in existing structures and are fully aware of their exploitative powers.

They warn with ample supporting evidence that co-optation by the establishment is perhaps the greatest threat to overall unity of purpose, even when there are token triumphs to be pointed to in support of, say, the arguments for gradualism and moderation, and the theory that 'if we bide our time and wait it will all come'.

The book is very well written and easily readable. Throughout the book one finds the authors answering questions one wants to put. It makes stimulating reading and, though it is riddled with quotations, one is spared pages of footnotes.

One criticism that might be levelled against the book is that the authors treated too summarily of the international situation, even given the scope of their work. Despite this, however, the framework offered by Black Power is for Black people everywhere. The validity of the Black Power arguments would have to be proven by many societies—perhaps most of all the United States itself—and probably using varied experiments.